

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 37-74 were pending prior to entry of the amendments herein. Claims 3, 6, 38-44, 46-49, 50, and 74 are amended herein, and Claims 1, 37, and 45 are canceled.

On November 9, 2009, a telephone interview was held between Examiner Ton and a representative of Applicants, Tina Chen. The Dowling reference and proposed amendments to the claims were discussed. Applicants agreed to file a formal response.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that Claims 51 and 55-73 are allowed. Applicants assume that Claims 52-54 are also allowed since they were indicated as allowed in the previously issued Office Action and the Examiner has not indicated a change in status for those claims.

The Examiner has also indicated that Claims 6, 41, 43, 44, 48, and 60 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants also assume that Claim 60 is *allowed* (as previously indicated), not allowable. Claims 6, 41, 43 and 48 are now allowable, as they have been amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Dependent Claims 3, 7, and 42 are amended to depend from amended Claim 6, and are now also allowable as they include all of the limitations of amended Claim 6. Claim 4, which depends from Claim 3, is also allowable. Dependent Claims 38-40 and 44 are amended to depend from amended Claim 41, and are now also allowable as they include all of the limitations of amended Claim 41. Dependent Claim 47 is amended to depend from amended Claim 43, and is now also allowable as it includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 43. Dependent Claims 46, 49, and 50 are amended to depend from amended Claim 48, and are now also allowable as they include all of the limitations of amended Claim 48. Furthermore, each of the dependent claims recites additional features of advantage and utility. Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments as they do not change the scope of the claims and would not require a new search.

Claim 74:

The Examiner noted that Claim 74 failed to claim a “light guide” that directs light emitted from the light source, and that the light guide “does not appear to be contained within the device of Dowling thus being distinguishable over Dowling.” Applicants submit that the “light guide” and “light source” were inadvertently omitted in the previously filed response and

respectfully request entry of the amendment of Claim 74 to recite the “light guide” and the “light source” such that Claim 74, as amended, would be allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 37, 38, 40, 42, 45-47, 49, 50, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dowling et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,248,239. Claims 1, 37, and 45 have been canceled.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowling et al. (7,248,239). As noted above, Claim 39 is amended to depend from independent Claim 41, which is now allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicants’ claimed invention.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4481 (Order No.APL1P215X1). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Tina Chen/
Tina Chen
Reg. No. 44,606

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
408-255-8001